

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 25-32 and 49-56 are pending. Claims 57-68 have been added, and claims 1 and 25 have been amended, without acquiescence in the Office Action's basis for neither rejections nor prejudice to pursue in a related application. No new matter has been added. Support can be found at least in paragraphs 31-35.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC Section 102

Claims 1-8, 25-32, and 49-56 have been rejected under 35 USC 102 (b) as allegedly being anticipated by Dalal (US Pat. No. 5,537,589) Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1, and similarly claim 25, explicitly recite the feature of “making the aggregated entry, the aggregated entry representing the plurality of entries and including a first field whose value is a metric value computed from a set of individual values of a field in the plurality of entries and a second field whose set value is a representation of the set of individual values, the metric value having the property that the individual values from which the metric value was computed cannot be derived from the metric value and the representation of the individual values having the property that the individual values are derivable therefrom, so that a single entry comprises both the metric value and the set value, wherein at least some of the individual values are lost with the metric value and the individual values are not lost with the set value” (emphasis added).

Dalal discloses database table aggregation using an aggregation index. Dalal discloses an entry in a table that is the sum of entries in other tables (i.e. Fig. 11 of Dalal). Dalal does not disclose or suggest any single entry within a single table that includes both the metric value and set value. Specifically, for example, in an embodiment, an entry may include fields of both set of hit times and number of hits. The set of hit times includes a list of all the individual time data. On the other hand, the number of hits is a value computed from the set of individual time data. The individual time data used to calculate the number of hits is not derivable from the number of hits value and is lost. Therefore, a roll up entry of the roll up table uses both lossy and lossless techniques depending on the desired field and information. Dalal does not disclose a single entry of a roll up table having both a lossy field and a lossless field. Specifically, Dalal does not disclose a single entry that has both a metric value and a set value as claimed. Dalal merely discloses an entry

includes a value that is the sum of values from another table. Clearly, Dalal, does not show within one single entry of a table having both a metric value where individual data has been lost as a result of a roll up process and a set value where all the individual data is stored for a roll up process. Therefore, Dalal does not teach or suggest at least the feature of “making the aggregated entry, the aggregated entry representing the plurality of entries and including a first field whose value is a metric value computed from a set of individual values of a field in the plurality of entries and a second field whose set value is a representation of the set of individual values, the metric value having the property that the individual values from which the metric value was computed cannot be derived from the metric value and the representation of the individual values having the property that the individual values are derivable therefrom, so that a single entry comprises both the metric value and the set value, wherein at least some of the individual values are lost with the metric value and the individual values are not lost with the set value” (emphasis added).

For at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Dala does not anticipate claim 1 and 25. Therefore, allowance of claims 1 and 25 are respectfully requested. For at least these same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 2-8, 26-32 and 49-56 are likewise not anticipated and are therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, all claims are believed allowable, and an allowance of the claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

While rendered moot by the above reasons, the Applicant notes and formally states that to the extent there are any suggestions or statements of admissions of prior art or judicial notice of art by the Office Action, those implications of admission by Applicant or judicial notice by the Office Action are hereby traversed.

Applicant(s) hereby explicitly retracts and rescinds any and all of the arguments and disclaimers presented to distinguish the prior art of record during the prosecution of all parent and related application(s)/patent(s), and respectfully requests that the Examiner re-visit the prior art that such arguments and disclaimers were made to avoid.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. **50-1105**, referencing billing number **OID 2002-247-01**. The Commissioner is authorized to credit any overpayment or to charge any underpayment to Vista IP Law Group's Deposit Account No. **50-1105**, referencing billing number **OID 2002-247-01**.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 10, 2011

Vista IP Law Group LLP
1885 Lundy Avenue,
Suite 108
San Jose, CA 95131
Telephone: (408) 321-8663

By: /Jasper Kwoh/
Jasper Kwoh
Registration No. 54,921
for
Peter C. Mei
Registration No. 39,768